

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 39, 41, 44, 45, 48, 50-53, 55-59, 61, 62, 65-67, 69 and 71-76 are pending. By this Amendment, claim 70 is cancelled, and claims 39, 44, 48, 51-53, 62, 69 and 71-73 are amended. Support for the amendments to claims 39, 44, 48, 51-53, 62, 69 and 71-73 can be found, for example, in FIGS. 1 and 2, and in original claims 39, 44, 48, 51-53, 62 and 69-73. No new matter is added. In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Personal Interview

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Soderquist during the October 15, 2007 Personal Interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated in the following remarks.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claims 39, 41, 44, 45, 48, 50-53, 55-59, 61, 62, 65-67 and 69-76 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,508,984 to Turner et al. ("Turner") in view of Moates, F.C., et al., Ind. & Eng. Chem. Rsch, 35:4801-4803 (1996) ("Moates"), U.S. Patent No. 6,541,271 to McFarland et al. ("McFarland"), WO 97/32208 or U.S. Patent No. 6,063,633 to Willson ("Willson") and U.S. Patent No. 5,959,297 to Weinberg et al. ("Weinberg"). By this Amendment, claim 70 is cancelled, rendering the rejection moot as to that claim. As to the remaining claims, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As indicated in the Office Action and discussed during the October 15, 2007 Personal Interview, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest a process or apparatus employing a configuration in which building blocks provided on a substrate can be subjected to first sensing and second sensing in a single location. Applicants submit that each of claims 39 and

62, as amended, is directed to a process or an apparatus that encompasses such a configuration. Accordingly, for at least this reason, claims 39 and 62 distinguish over the cited references.


Claims 39 and 62 would not have been rendered obvious by Turner, Moates, McFarland, Willson, and Weinberg. Claims 41, 44, 45, 48, 50-53, 55-59, 61, 65-67, 69 and 71-76 depend variously from claims 39 and 62 and, thus, also would not have been rendered obvious by Turner, Moates, McFarland, Willson, and Weinberg. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claims 39, 41, 44, 45, 48, 50-53, 55-59, 61, 62, 65-67, 69 and 71-76 are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Jacob A. Doughty
Registration No. 46,671

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)